

EP3260: Machine Learning Over Networks Lecture 3: Centralized Convex ML (part 2)

Hossein S. Ghadikolaei

Division of Network and Systems Engineering School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden https://sites.google.com/view/mlons2023/home

January 2023

Learning outcomes

- Recap of (deterministic) iterative algorithms for convex optimization
- Stochastic optimization
- Variance reduction techniques
- Convergence analysis

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-1

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- 5. Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Recap of Lecture 2 and beyond!

Smooth problems (L-smooth, μ -strong convexity)

Gradient descent: $\min \operatorname{imize}_{{\boldsymbol w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \ f({\boldsymbol w})$, $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for convex

Projected gradient descent: minimize $_{{\boldsymbol w}\in \mathcal{W}}$ $f({\boldsymbol w})$, $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for convex

Steepest descent: $\min \operatorname{minimize}_{\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathcal{W}} f(\boldsymbol{w})$, large L/μ , $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for convex

Newton's methods: $\min \operatorname{minimize}_{{\boldsymbol w} \in \mathcal{W}} f({\boldsymbol w})$, large L/μ

Acceleration methods: $\min \text{imize}_{\pmb{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \ f(\pmb{w})$, large L/μ , $\mathcal{O}(1/k^2)$ for convex

Nonsmooth problems

Subgradient methods: $\min \text{imize}_{m{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \ f(m{w})$, $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for convex

Proximal methods: minimize $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ g(w) + h(w), $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$ for smooth f

Accelerated proximal methods: minimize $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ g(w) + h(w), convex h, $\kappa = L/\mu$

update:
$$w_{k+1} = \operatorname{prox}_{\alpha_k h}(v_k - \alpha_k \nabla g(v_k))$$

momentum from prev. iteration: $m{v}_{k+1} = m{w}_{k+1} + rac{\sqrt{\kappa}-1}{\sqrt{\kappa}+1}(m{w}_{k+1}-m{w}_k)$

Centralized Convex ML (part 2)

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Basic definitions

Convexity for differentiable function:

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{w}_2 - \boldsymbol{w}_1) \le f(\boldsymbol{w}_2) - f(\boldsymbol{w}_1)$$

Strongly convexity:

$$f(\mathbf{w}_2) \ge f(\mathbf{w}_1) + \nabla f(\mathbf{w}_1)^T (\mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_1) + \frac{\mu}{2} ||\mathbf{w}_2 - \mathbf{w}_1||_2^2$$

Smoothness:

$$f(w_2) \le f(w_1) + \nabla f(w_1)^T (w_2 - w_1) + \frac{L}{2} ||w_2 - w_1||_2^2$$

Bounded error for initial guess: $\mathbb{E}\left[\|oldsymbol{w}_1 - oldsymbol{w}^\star\|_2
ight] \leq R$

Lipschitz continuity (bounded gradients)

$$\| \boldsymbol{w} \|_2 \le D \Rightarrow \| \nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}) \|_2 \le B$$
 or $\| \boldsymbol{w}_1 \|_2, \| \boldsymbol{w}_2 \|_2 \le D \Rightarrow |f(\boldsymbol{w}_2) - f(\boldsymbol{w}_1)| \le B \| \boldsymbol{w}_2 - \boldsymbol{w}_1 \|_2$

Example

Consider Human Activity Recognition Using Smartphones dataset $\{(\pmb{x}_i,y_i)\}_{i\in[N]}$

inputs: accelerometer and gyroscope sensors

output: moving (e.g., walking , running, dancing) or not (sitting or standing)

Consider logistic ridge regression: minimize $f(\boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} f_i(\boldsymbol{w}) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2$ where $f_i(\boldsymbol{w}) = \log \left(1 + \exp\{-y_i \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}_i\}\right)$

For classification, we can use the solution $m{w}^{\star}$ and compute $\mathrm{sign}(m{w}^{\star T}m{x})$

HW 2.1:

- 1) Is f Lipschitz continuous? If so, find a small B?
- 2) Is f_i smooth? If so, find a small L for f_i ? What about f?
- 3) Is f strongly convex? If so, find a high μ ?

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- 5. Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Setting

• Batch GD: Let $f({m w}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} f_i({m w})$

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{w}_k - \alpha_k \nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) = \boldsymbol{w}_k - \frac{\alpha_k}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$$

Stochastic gradient (SG) methods:

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{w}_k - \alpha_k \ g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k) = \boldsymbol{w}_k - \alpha_k \widehat{\nabla} f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$$

 $\zeta_k \in [N]$, and $g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)$ is a noisy version ("estimation") of $\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$.

Method	Per iteration cost	# iterations
GD	Expensive (usually linear in N)	Usually few
SG	Very cheap, independent of N	Many

Main tradeoff: Per-iteration cost vs per-iteration improvement

Motivations for SG

Good theoretical guarantees: Consider strongly convex smooth f, then

- GD: $f(w_k) f(w^\star) \le \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$, $\rho \in (0,1)$, so $N \log(1/\epsilon)$ total work for ϵ -optimality
- SG (basic version): $\mathbb{E}[f(w_k) f(w^\star)] \leq \mathcal{O}(1/k)$, so $1/\epsilon$ total work for ϵ -optimality
- Compare $N\log(1/\epsilon)$ to $1/\epsilon$ for large N

Heavy computation

- Large scale optimization, $N \to \infty$, large matrix inversion

Heavy communication

- Bandwidth-limited distributed optimization

Privacy

- Revealing only a noisy gradient information

Nonconvex optimization and saddle points

Centralized Convex ML (part 2)

Generic SG algorithm for decentralized optimization

A generic SG algorithm

```
Initialize m{w}_1 for k=1,2,\ldots, do Generate a realization of the random variable \zeta_k Compute a stochastic vector g(m{w}_k;\zeta_k) Choose step-size \alpha_k>0 Update m{w}_{k+1}\leftarrow m{w}_k-\alpha_k g(m{w}_k;\zeta_k) end for
```

- Problem: minimize $f(\boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} f_i(\boldsymbol{w})$.
- Examples of stochastic vector

Gradient for one sample: $abla f_{\zeta_k}(w_k)$

Gradient for a mini-batch: $\frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i \in [N_k]} \nabla f_{\zeta_k,i}(w_k)$

Preconditioned mini-batch gradient: $H_k \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{i \in [N_k]} \nabla f_{\zeta_k,i}(w_k)$

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-10

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Smoothness

Observe that w_{k+1} depends only on ζ_k , and assume i.i.d. $(\zeta_k)_k$

 $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}[f(m{w}_{k+1})]$: expectation of $f(m{w}_{k+1})$ wrt the distribution of ζ_k only

f being L-smooth implies that the generic SG algorithm satisfies for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})] - f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \leq \\ &- \underbrace{\alpha_k \nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)^T \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)\right]}_{\text{expected decrease}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 L \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[\|g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)\|_2^2\right]}_{\text{noise}} \end{split}$$

If $g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)$ is an unbiased estimate of $\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})] - f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \le -\alpha_k \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_k^2 L \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[\|g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)\|_2^2 \right]$$
 (1)

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-12

Some useful assumptions

- The sequence $\{ m{w}_k \}$ is contained in an open set over which f is bounded below by a scalar f_{\inf}
- There exist scalars $c_0 \geq c > 0$ s.t. for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)^T \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k) \right] \ge c \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2$$
 (2a)

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}\left[g(\boldsymbol{w}_k;\zeta_k)\right]\|_2 \le c_0 \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2 \tag{2b}$$

- There exist scalars $M \geq 0$ and $M_V \geq 0$ s.t. for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\operatorname{Var}_{\zeta_k}\left[g(\boldsymbol{w}_k;\zeta_k)\right] \le M + M_V \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2 \tag{3}$$

For unbiased gradient estimator: $c = c_0 = 1$

(2) and (3) imply (HW 2.2: find M_G .)

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[\|g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)\|_2^2 \right] \le M + M_G \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2$$

An important tradeoff

Generic SG algorithm on L-smooth function satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_{k}}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})] - f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k}) \\
\leq -c\alpha_{k} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k})\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{k}^{2}L\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_{k}} \left[\|g(\boldsymbol{w}_{k};\zeta_{k})\|_{2}^{2}\right] \\
\leq -\left(c - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{k}LM_{G}\right)\alpha_{k} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k})\|_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{k}^{2}LM \tag{4}$$

Proof: see the board

Convergence of SG depends on the balance between blue and red terms

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Strongly convex f and fixed step-size

Theorem 1

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and constant step-size $\alpha_k = \alpha$ satisfying

$$0 < \alpha \le \frac{c}{LM_G} \,, \tag{5}$$

the expected optimality gap satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k}) - f^{\star}\right] \leq \frac{\alpha L M}{2\mu c} + (1 - \alpha \mu c)^{k-1} \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_{1}) - f^{\star} - \frac{\alpha L M}{2\mu c}\right)$$

$$\xrightarrow{k \to \infty} \frac{\alpha L M}{2\mu c} \tag{6}$$

where $M_G = M_V + c_0^2$.

If $g(\boldsymbol{w}_k; \zeta_k)$ is unbiased estimate of $\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$, then c=1, we may assume $M_G=1$ and retrieve $\alpha \in (0,1/L]$ of GD

▶ Proof

Additional notes

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star}\right] - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c} \le (1 - \alpha\mu c)^{k-1} \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f^{\star} - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c}\right)$$

Fast convergence to a neighborhood of the optimal value, but noise in the gradient prevented further progress (convergence to an ambiguity ball)

Optimality gap $\frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c}$

Contraction constant after k iteration $(1 - \alpha \mu c)^{k-1}$

A simple modification: run SG with a fixed step-size, and after convergence halve the step-size and run SG again, ...

- How $E[f(oldsymbol{w}_k)]$ against k behaves now?
- No sub-optimality gap
- Each time the step-size is cut in half, double the number of iterations are required
- Effective convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$, why?

Strongly convex f and diminishing step-size

Theorem 2

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and diminishing step-size α_k satisfying

$$\alpha_k = \frac{\beta}{\gamma + k}, \text{ for some } \frac{\beta}{\beta} > \frac{1}{\mu c} \text{ and } \gamma > 0 \text{ s.t. } \alpha_1 \leq \frac{c}{LM_G},$$

the expected optimality gap satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^*\right] \le \frac{\nu}{\gamma + k} \tag{7}$$

where

$$u := \max \left\{ \frac{\beta^2 LM}{2\left(\beta\mu c - 1\right)}, \left(\gamma + 1\right)\left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f^{\star}\right) \right\}$$

Usually first term of ν determines the asymptotic convergence of $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\pmb{w}_k)-f^\star\right]$

▶ Proof

Additional notes

New step-size parameter $\beta > \frac{1}{\mu c}$:

Sensitive to overestimation of μ

higher $\mu \to \text{ smaller } \beta \to \text{ slower convergence rate}$

Constant step-size and mini-batch vs diminishing step-size

For mini-batch, define $g(\pmb{w}_k;\zeta_k)=\frac{1}{N_m}\sum_{i\in[N_m]}\nabla f_{\zeta_k,i}(\pmb{w}_k)$

Mini-batch with small constant $\alpha > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star}\right] \leq \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c N_m} + (1 - \alpha\mu c)^{k-1} \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f^{\star} - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c N_m}\right)$$

Simple SG with small constant α/N_m , (cheap iterations, many iterations)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^*\right] \le \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c N_m} + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \mu c}{N_m}\right)^{k-1} \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f^* - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c N_m}\right)$$

Centralized Convex ML (part 2)

Convex f and diminishing step-size

Notations:

- $\mathbb{E}[g(w;\zeta_k)|w_k]\in\partial f(w_k)$: noisy unbiased sub-gradient of convex f
- $f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) = \min(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1), \dots, f(\boldsymbol{w}_k))$
- $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g(\boldsymbol{w}_k;\zeta_k)\|_2^2\right] \leq G^2$ for all k, and $\sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathcal{W}}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{w}_1-\boldsymbol{w}^\star\|_2^2\right] \leq R^2$

Theorem 3

Under some mild conditions and for square summable but not summable step-size, we have convergence in expectation

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star}\right] \leq \frac{R^2 + G^2 \sum_{i \in [k]} \alpha_i^2}{2 \sum_{i \in [k]} \alpha_i}$$

and for any arbitrary $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, we have convergence in probability:

$$\Pr\left(f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star} \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \delta$$



Convex f and diminishing step-size

Theorem 4

For convex L-smooth function f, i.i.d. stochastic gradient of variance bound σ^2 , and diminishing step-size $\alpha_k=\frac{1}{L+\gamma^{-1}}$, where $\gamma=\frac{R}{G}\sqrt{\frac{2}{k}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i\in[k]}\boldsymbol{w}_k\right) - f^*\right] \le R\sqrt{\frac{2\sigma^2}{k}} + \frac{LR^2}{k} \tag{8}$$

Proof: see [Bubeck 2015, Theorem 6.3]

Improved gain for mini-batch of size $N_m \colon \sigma^2 o \sigma^2/N_m$

Non-convex objective function

Theorem 5

With fixed step-size as of (5), for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k\in[K]}\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2\right] \leq \frac{K\alpha LM}{c} + \frac{2(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f_{\inf})}{c\alpha}$$
(9)

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k\in[K]}\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2\right] \leq \frac{\alpha LM}{c} + \frac{2(f(\boldsymbol{w}_1) - f_{\inf})}{Kc\alpha} \xrightarrow{K\to\infty} \frac{\alpha LM}{c}$$
 (10)

Proof: Recursively $\forall k \in [K]$, take total expectation from (4), use (5), observe

$$f_{\inf} - f(w_1) \le \mathbb{E}[f(w_{K+1})] - f(w_1) \le -\frac{1}{2}c\alpha \sum_{k \in [K]} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\nabla f(w_k)\|_2^2\right] + \frac{1}{2}K\alpha^2 LM.$$

 f_{inf} is not necessarily f^{\star}

SG spends increasingly more time in regions where the objective function has a "relatively" small gradient. Also usual tradeoff on step-size.

Non-convex objective function

Theorem 6

With square summable but not summable step-size, we have for any $K\in {\rm I\!N}$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k\in[K]}\alpha_k\|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2\right]<\infty \tag{11}$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\sum_{k \in [K]} a_k} \sum_{k \in [K]} \alpha_k \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2\right] \xrightarrow{K \to \infty} 0 \tag{12}$$

Proof: **HW 2.3**!

The expected gradient norm cannot stay bounded away from zero

Foods for thought

1. Recall from Theorem 1 that SG with a constant step-size converges linearly to an ambiguity ball whose radius is determined by the variance of the gradient noise

Observe that taking $N_k>1$ samples "with replacement" implies multiplying the radius of the ambiguity ball by N_k^{-1} and conclude "doubling the batch size cuts the error in half"

Observe that taking $N_k>1$ samples "without replacement" implies multiplying the radius of the ambiguity ball by $\frac{N-N_k}{NN_k}$

Modify the generic SG algorithm with a dynamic batch size.

Can we recover the linear convergence rate to w^* ? Linear in terms of iterations or workload (effect computations)? Note the increasing cost of iterations (due to larger N_k with k)

2. Often in practice, features (inputs, $x \in \mathcal{X}$) of dimension d are very sparse (at most $z \ll d$ non-zero elements)

Modify SG method to have $\mathcal{O}(z)$ cost per iteration instead of the original $\mathcal{O}(d)$

Can we do that for all objective functions? What about an SVM classifier?

3. In decentralized/distributed computing, we may have a high communication overhead to exchange w_k among workers. Can we use the vanilla SG method to tradeoff the costs between computation and communication?

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-24

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- 5. Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Stochastic variance reduced gradient (SVRG)

SVRG (Johnson&Zhang, 2013; Zhang et. al., 2013)

```
Inputs: Epoch length T, number of epochs K for k=1,2,\ldots,K do  \begin{array}{c} \text{Compute all gradients and store } \widetilde{\nabla} f:=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in[N]}\nabla f_i(\widetilde{w}_k)\\ \text{Initialize } w_{k,0}\leftarrow\widetilde{w}_k\\ \text{for } t{=}1,\ldots,\mathsf{T}\text{ do}\\ \text{Sample } \zeta_k\text{ uniformly from } [N]\\ w_{k,t}\leftarrow w_{k,t-1}-\alpha_k\left(\nabla f_{\zeta_k}(w_{k,t-1})-\nabla f_{\zeta_k}(\widetilde{w}_k)+\widetilde{\nabla} f\right)\\ \text{end for}\\ \text{Update } \widetilde{w}_{k+1}\leftarrow w_{k,T}\\ \text{end for}\\ \text{Return: } \widetilde{w}_{K+1} \end{array}
```

- One memory, two gradients per inner loop
- Linear convergence rate (given a sufficiently large T)

▶ Proof

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-26

Stochastic average gradient (SAG)

SAG (Schmidt&Le Roux&Bach, 2012, 2017)

```
\begin{array}{l} \text{for } k=1,2,\ldots,\, \text{do} \\ \text{Sample } \zeta_k \text{ uniformly from } [N] \text{ and observe } \nabla f_{\zeta_k}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \\ \text{Update for all } i\in[N], \ \hat{g}_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k) = \begin{cases} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k), & \text{if } i=\zeta_k\\ \hat{g}_i(\boldsymbol{w}_{k-1}), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \text{Update } \boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{w}_k - \frac{\alpha_k}{N} \sum_{i\in[N]} \hat{g}_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \\ \text{end for} \end{array}
```

- Almost same convergence rate (and same proof) as of SVRG
- A memory of size N
- Biased gradient estimates: $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in[N]}\hat{g}_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\right] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in[N]}\nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{w}_k)$ does not hold necessarily
- Table averaging representation and SAGA extension

Which algorithm to choose?

CA1: Closed-form solution vs iterative approaches

$$\text{Consider } \boldsymbol{x}^{\star} = \underset{\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{minimize}} \ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \|\boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_i\|^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2 \text{ for dataset } \{(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_i)\}$$

- 1) Find a closed-form solution for this problem
- 2) Consider "Individual household electric power consumption" dataset ($N=2075259,\ d=9$) and find the optimal linear regressor from the closed-form expression
- 3) Repeat 2) for "Greenhouse gas observing network" dataset ($N=2921,\ d=5232$) and observe the scalability issue of the closed-form expression
 - 4) How would you address even bigger datasets?

CA2: Deterministic/stochastic algorithms in practice

Consider logistic ridge regression $f(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} f_i(w) + \lambda \|w\|_2^2$ where $f_i(w) = \log\left(1 + \exp\{-y_i w^T x_i\}\right)$ for "Greenhouse gas observing network" dataset

- 1) Solve the optimization problem using GD, stochastic GD, SVRG, and SAG
- 2) Tune a bit hyper-parameters (including λ)
- 3) Compare these solvers in terms complexity of hyper-parameter tunning, convergence time, convergence rate (in terms of # outer-loop iterations), and memory requirement

Centralized Convex ML (part 2) 3-28

Some references

- L. Bottou, F. E. Curtis, and J. Nocedal, "Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning," SIAM Review, 2018.
- S. Bubeck, "Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity," Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 2015.
- S. Boyd and A. Mutapcic, "Stochastic subgradient methods," Lecture Notes for EE364b, Stanford University, 2018.
- R. Johnson and T. Zhang, "Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction," NIPS, 2013.
- L. Zhang, M. Mahdavi, and R. Jin, "Linear convergence with condition number independent access of full gradients," NIPS 2013.
- M. Schmidt, N. Le Roux, and F. Bach, "Minimizing finite sums with the stochastic average gradient," Mathematical Programming, 2017.

3-29

- 1. Basic definitions and properties
- 2. Problem Statement
- 3. Fundamental Lemmas and Assumptions
- 4. Convergence Results for SG
- 5. Variance Reduction Techniques
- 6. Supplements

Proof sketch for Theorem 1

Use (4), Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality (a consequence of strong convexity) and (5), and observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})] - f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \le -\left(c - \frac{1}{2}\alpha L M_G\right) \alpha \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 L M$$

$$\le -\frac{1}{2}\alpha c \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{w}_k)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 L M$$

$$\le -\alpha \mu c \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^*\right) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 L M$$

Subtract f^* from both sides, take total expectation, and rearrange:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}) - f^{\star}\right] \leq (1 - \alpha\mu c) \mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k}) - f^{\star}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^{2}LM$$

Make it a contraction inequality (as $0 < \alpha \mu c \le \frac{\mu c^2}{LM_G} \le \frac{\mu}{L} \le 1$)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}) - f^{\star}\right] - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c} \leq (1 - \alpha\mu c) \left(\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k}) - f^{\star}\right] - \frac{\alpha LM}{2\mu c}\right).$$

Return

Proof sketch for Theorem 2

First observe that $\alpha_k LM_G \leq \alpha_1 LM_G \leq c$. Use (4) and Polyak-Lojasiewicz inequality and show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1})] - f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \le -\alpha_k \mu c \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^* \right) + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_k^2 LM$$

Subtract f^* from both sides, take total expectation, and rearrange:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1}) - f^{\star}\right] \le (1 - \alpha_k \mu c) \,\mathbb{E}\left[f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_k^2 LM$$

Now prove by induction and use inequality $k^2 \ge (k+1)(k-1)$

▶ Return

Proof sketch for Theorem 3

Use convexity of $f\left(f^\star - f(\boldsymbol{w}_k) \geq \mathbb{E}[g(\boldsymbol{w};\zeta_k)|\boldsymbol{w}_k]^T(\boldsymbol{w}^\star - \boldsymbol{w}_k)\right)$ to show

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}^{\star}\|_{2}^{2} \mid \boldsymbol{w}_{k}\right] \leq \|\boldsymbol{w}_{k} - \boldsymbol{w}^{\star}\|_{2}^{2} - 2\alpha_{k}\left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k}) - f^{\star}\right) + \alpha_{k}^{2}G^{2}$$

Take expectation nd apply recursively to show

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{w}_{k+1} - \boldsymbol{w}^{\star}\|_{2}^{2}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{w}_{1} - \boldsymbol{w}^{\star}\|_{2}^{2}] - 2\sum_{i \in [k]}\alpha_{i}\left(\mathbb{E}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_{i})] - f^{\star}\right) + G^{2}\sum_{i \in [k]}\alpha_{i}^{2}$$

Conclude that for square summable but not summable step-size, $\min_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{E}[f(m{w}_i)] o f^\star$

Use Jensen's inequality and concavity of minimum to show convergence in expectation $\mathbb{E}[f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k)] = \mathbb{E}[\min_{i \in [k]} f(\boldsymbol{w}_i)] \leq \min_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{E}[f(\boldsymbol{w}_i)] \to f^\star$

Use Markov's inequality to show convergence in probability:

$$\Pr(f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star} \ge \epsilon) \le \frac{\mathbb{E}[f_{\mathsf{best}}(\boldsymbol{w}_k) - f^{\star}]}{\epsilon}$$

▶ Return

Linear convergence of SVRG

Variance decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{w} - \mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{w}\right]\right\|_{2}^{2}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{w}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right] - \left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\boldsymbol{w}\right]\right\|_{2}^{2} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\boldsymbol{w}\right\|_{2}^{2}\right]$$

Show

$$\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k} \left[\left\| \nabla f_{\zeta_k}(\boldsymbol{w}_{k,t-1}) - \nabla f_{\zeta_k}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_k) + \widetilde{\nabla} f \right\|_2^2 \right] \leq 4L \left(f(\boldsymbol{w}_{k,t-1}) + f(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_k) - 2f^* \right)$$

Use the inner-loop iteration and bound $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}\left[\|m{w}_{k,t}-m{w}^\star\|_2^2\right]$. You may need to use convexity of f

Sum $\mathbb{E}_{\zeta_k}\left[\|\pmb{w}_{k,t}-\pmb{w}^\star\|_2^2\right]$ over the inner loop $(t\in[T])$ and cancel some terms from both sides

Show and use for every outer iteration to observe the linear convergence rate: if a < ba + c for $b \in (0,1)$, then

$$a - \frac{c}{1 - b} \le b \left(a - \frac{c}{1 - b} \right)$$

▶ Return